

BOOK NOTICE

Check List of the Cicadellidæ (Homoptera) of America, North of Mexico. By Dwight M. DeLong and Dorothy J. Knull. Graduate School Studies. Biological Science Series No. 1. 102 pages, 6 × 9 inches, paper bound, 1945. The Ohio State University Press, Columbus, Ohio.

This publication, a revision of the DeLong and Caldwell list issued in 1937, is a great improvement over the previous volume with respect to format, printing, arrangement of species lists, and general accuracy. The reviewer feels certain that the present list will be welcomed by all general workers, for whom it is apparently primarily intended. The most important changes in the basic information, as contrasted with the 1937 list, are the inclusion of genotypes of the listed genera and the alphabetical arrangement of species within the various genera. Errors in bibliographic citations and spelling of scientific names are few.

The reviewer recognizes that the supergeneric classification of a group, especially the arrangement of genera, is to some extent a matter of individual opinion. It is felt that the arrangement followed in the present list will not have wide acceptance by workers in the group, and it seems fairly clear that the groupings used have resulted from unfamiliarity with related exotic forms or from lack of critical analysis of structural characters of the North American representatives. For example, the placement of *Nionia* in the subfamily Eurymelinæ is in itself somewhat startling, but to place that genus between *Macropsis* and *Oncopsis* can be supported on no other grounds than that of an alphabetical arrangement. Similarly, the interposition of *Kinonia* between *Pedumella* and *Gladionura* in the *Athysanella* complex seems without justification; on the basis of structural characters of the head *Kinonia* logically belongs with *Gillettiella*, *Stirellus*, and *Penestirellus*, none of which are closely related to *Athysanella*.

These items, *i.e.*, the sequence of genera and the supergeneric classification, are of particular interest only to the specialist in the group and should not detract from the value of the publication to the general worker. However, there are a few faults

that may lead to difficulties for users of the list and to which it seems worth while to call attention.

In several instances the authors have quite properly adopted different generic names than have been in current use in the group. Unfortunately, generic synonymy is not indicated and in those instances in which new generic synonymy is involved the change is not indicated except by the inclusion of the genotype of the rejected name among the species listed under the name adopted. Thus it is assumed that *Cyperana* DeLong is suppressed as a synonym of *Cicadula* Zetterstedt, *Conodonus* Ball suppressed as a synonym of *Colladonus* Ball, *Drionia* Ball suppressed as a synonym of *Cochlorhinus* Uhler, and so on. It would have been much better had such changes been clearly indicated in the accepted manner. With respect to names formerly given subgeneric status it is impossible to know whether they are considered as straight synonyms in this list, or whether they are simply omitted from the scheme of classification. The omission of subgeneric names and generic synonyms detracts from the value of the list for future bibliographic work.

The authors state in the introduction that "An asterisk placed before a name indicates a new combination or arrangement not previously published." This appears to have been an optional procedure that was very sparingly exercised. A careful examination of the list reveals the use of an asterisk in ten places, but in only two instances is the meaning of the asterisk clearly indicated. In those two instances it indicates new synonymy. In other places it is used to indicate a new combination and status, new usage of a supergeneric category, new combination, new synonymy, new status for a generic name, or a new group designation. A large proportion of the changes, particularly new combinations and new synonymy, are not indicated as such.

In spite of the criticisms indicated in this review, the "Check List of the Cicadellidæ" should fill a useful place in the literature of the group as a handy reference work for both specialists and general workers.—P. W. OMAN, Division of Insect Identification, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, United States Department of Agriculture.